

THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY



3 1151 02745 1321

ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

No. 85.]

JULY 25, 1831.

[VOL. iv. No. 13.]

I. REPORTS OF PROTECTORS OF SLAVES.—II. BERBICE.—*Manumissions*;—*Marriages*;—*Savings' Bank*;—*Domestic Punishments*;—*Complaints of Slaves*, viz. Cases of 1. Friday;—2. Georgiana;—3. Jan Zwart;—4. Christina;—5. Richard;—6. Jason;—7. Geluk and Coenraad;—8. January; 9. Wilhelmina;—10. Quaco;—11. Paul and others;—12. Nancy;—13. Peggy; 14. Adam and others;—15. Castlereagh;—16. Johanna;—17. Margaret and Present;—*General Observations on Excess of Labour*;—*on Sunday Labour*; and *on Religious Instruction*;—*Concluding Reflections*.

II. DONATIONS AND REMITTANCES.

I. REPORTS OF PROTECTORS.—II. BERBICE.

THE Report of the Protector of Slaves in Berbice, (numbered 262) comprises Returns of his proceedings for twenty months and a half,* commencing the 1st of October, 1828, and terminating the 14th of May, 1830, on which day the new Order in Council of February 2, 1830, came into operation.

The number of MANUMISSIONS effected in that time was 92, of which 29 consisted of persons liberated from an illegal bondage, in which many of them had been long held, though fully entitled to their freedom, either as the descendants of Indian mothers, or on other grounds. The number that may properly be said to be manumitted, therefore, either by the will of the master, or by purchase, is reduced to 63.

The number of MARRIAGES of slaves, in the same period, was 26.

The sums deposited in the SAVINGS' BANK by slaves, chiefly mechanics belonging to Government, amounted to 1,543 guilders, of which 1,297 guilders had been withdrawn. The amount remaining in deposit, at the end of the above period, was 5,014 guilders.

The following is the number of DOMESTIC PUNISHMENTS inflicted on the plantation slaves of Berbice, during a period of two years, from Jan. 1, 1828, to Dec. 31, 1829, viz:—

Date.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Jan. 1, to June 30, 1828,	3,054	1,775	4,829
July 1, to Dec. 31, 1828,	3,320	2,313	5,633
Jan. 1, to June 30, 1829,	3,173	2,499	5,672
July 1, to Dec. 31, 1829,	3,097	2,009	5,106
	12,644	8,596	21,240

The punishments, therefore, inflicted in Berbice during these two years, at the caprice of the master or manager, amounts to more in

* The returns of domestic punishments embrace a somewhat longer period.

number than the whole population of the Colony, which, by the last return, was nearly 21,000. But this is far too favourable a view of the case. No Record is kept, nor any return made to the Protector, of the punishments inflicted by proprietors who are not possessed of six slaves or upwards, and these may be in larger proportion than the others. The numbers so circumstanced must, therefore, be withdrawn from the whole population in order to give the real number of slaves included in this return. Besides these, if we deduct the young under eleven years of age, and the invalid and aged, who are not likely to have been visited with the infliction either of the cart-whip or of any of its substitutes, the number of the remaining plantation slaves, among whom these 21,240 punishments must have been distributed, probably did not exceed ten or eleven thousand at most. So that it is as if each individual slave in this Colony, who, from his age and circumstances, is liable to be included in the Record of punishments, had undergone the penalty of the cart-whip or the stocks, at least once in each year. Can we even fancy any state of society more thoroughly degraded than this? Now all these punishments are inflicted without trial, not by a judge or magistrate, but at the bidding of any ruffian who may own a slave, or who may be employed to superintend the labour of a slave, and who may thus punish men, women and children, his fellow-creatures and fellow-subjects, made in God's image, and redeemed by the blood of Christ, for any offence real or imaginary, or for no offence; the said ruffian being, within certain limits, if he so please, in his own person, sole prosecutor, witness, judge, jury, and executioner. And let us note the nature of some of those undefined and undefinable looks, words, or actions which these notoriously low, ignorant, violent and licentious individuals, are authorized, not only to punish by stripes and stocks, but actually to create and constitute *crimes*. They are such, for example, as "disobedience," "insolence," "insubordination," "abuse," "neglect of duty," "neglect of prayers," "idleness," "laziness," "eating dirt," "lying," "lewdness," "indecentcy," "swearing," &c.,—offences defined by no statute, requiring no evidence, but resting alike, for proof and for punishment, on the sense of justice and the humane feeling of slave-owners, or slave-drivers.—Such is society and such is law in Berbice, a British Colony, subject to the direct and uncontrolled legislation of His Majesty and his Council; for the law which sanctions these violations of humanity and justice is theirs; and on their *fiat* alone it depends whether all these abominations shall cease, or shall continue to grind to the very dust thousands of His Majesty's subjects, and to load this nation and its government with guilt and crime. It is absolutely sickening to think of it! But to proceed.

We come now to the complaints preferred, by slaves, to the Protector between the 1st of September, 1828, and the 14th of May, 1830, when the new Order in Council came into operation.

1. By turning to our 2nd Vol. No. 43, p. 362, the reader will find the case of a slave of the name of FRIDAY, who, having a trade, and being allowed to hire himself out, had accumulated some money, and being unable, we presume, under the then existing laws of the Colony

to purchase his freedom, had invested it, through the medium of a trustee, in a piece of land, and on that land had erected a house which cost him 2,000 guilders. Of this house and land his master, Mr. Emery, had taken forcible possession, and dying in 1821, had left it to his concubine, Mary Emery. Mr. Hill, *Friday's* trustee, might indeed have opposed this iniquitous appropriation and disposition of the property, but he was timid, and did not wish to interfere between master and slave. It was not until the arrival of a Protector at Berbice, in 1826, that *Friday* had any hope of obtaining the slightest redress for this cruel wrong and robbery. He accordingly applied to the Protector, who, after calling in vain on Miss Emery to produce her title to the house and land, proceeded to institute a suit against her on *Friday's* behalf, through Mr. Daly, the King's Advocate. Mr. Power, the Protector, was forced by ill health to quit the Colony for a time. On his return, in August, 1828, he found that no steps had been taken to vindicate *Friday's* rights, and the reason given for this neglect by the King's Advocate was, that there was, in his opinion, no proof to substantiate *Friday's* claim, *Friday* himself having, since Mr. Emery's death, been sold, together with Mr. Emery's other property, to other parties. The Protector, not acquiescing in this view of the case, brought the matter, through the medium of another advocate, Mr. Firebrace, before the Court of Civil Justice, Mr. Daly then appearing as the advocate of the defendant, Mary Emery. The case was very ably argued by Mr. Firebrace, who exposed the gross iniquity of the whole transaction, as well as the base subterfuges, false pleas, and equivocations, by which it had been sought to defeat the just rights of the poor slave. The result of the trial is thus announced, in a letter from Mr. Firebrace to the Protector, dated February 1, 1829. (We should wish to have seen the sentence of the Court.)—"I have the honour to inform you that the first Marshal of the Colony has, this day, put the slave *Friday* in possession of the house and land decreed to him by sentence of the Honourable Court of Civil Justice, dated the 23d of January last. The defendant in the above cause, Mary Emery, having tendered possession of the property in dispute, previous to the costs awarded by said sentence being taxed, I directed such tender to be accepted under special reservation of the right of proceeding in execution (should it be deemed necessary) to compel payment of such costs. His Excellency has referred the account to the Court of Civil Justice for taxation, at its next ordinary session in April. The poverty of the defendant makes it very doubtful whether the amount can be recovered from her. It is therefore my intention to memorialize the Council of Government to pay the same." (No. 262, of 1831, p. 15.)

Not a word is here said of the arrears of rent owing to poor *Friday*, with interest for the eight years during which the land and house had been in the occupancy of Mary Emery; nor of the further arrears which may have occurred prior to the death of Mr. Emery, and for which his heirs, executors, and assigns, if he has any, must be considered as equitably liable. We trust that the Protector will be instructed to look farther into this matter.

In the earlier stages of this case, the Fiscal, to whom it had been submitted, refused to interfere, on the alleged ground that, at the time Friday was divested of his house and land, a slave could not, by law, hold any property. What an untruth then did the Council of Berbice put into the mouths of His Majesty and his Privy Council, when they suggested as a correct preamble to the 27th clause of the Slave Ordinance for Berbice, of the 25th of September, 1826, the following words:—

“Whereas, by the *usage* of this Colony, persons in a state of slavery have hitherto been permitted to acquire, hold, and enjoy property free from control; and it is expedient that the said *custom* should be recognized, and as far as need be, established by law: Be it therefore enacted,” &c. What is this but a deliberate fraud?

We dwell upon this incident at more length, as furnishing a decisive refutation of that barefaced imposture, we mean the Abstract appended to the West Indian Manifesto, by *forty-one* distinguished West Indians, and particularly of that part of it which affirms the right which the slave has always had to the acquisition, possession, and enjoyment of property. The country, and Parliament too, we trust, will at length come to understand the value which is to be attached to the statements of men who subsist by a system of oppression, thus upheld and protected by deceit.

2. GEORGIANA, belonging to Plantation Reliance, complained (September, 1828) that for not finishing her task she was placed in the stocks, her failure to do so arising from debility, caused by her having been worked for the preceding eight days on the treadmill.—And at the same time four other women belonging to the same estate, MERSEY, SALLY, SIBELLA, and DIDO, complained of having been placed in the stocks for refusing to water the canes after they had finished the day's task that had been allotted to them. The complaints were against Mr. Gray, the manager. The only witnesses heard in his behalf, as to *these* facts, (we omit some collateral but irrelevant matters) were Mr. Gray himself, the party accused, and his driver, William, both of whom denied their truth. On this most unsatisfactory of all defences;—the mere plea of *not guilty*;—the Protector decided as follows, “Taking into consideration that eight days work on the treadmill had not had any effect upon the conduct of Georgiana, to which, upon recommendation of the local magistrate, she had been sent for her past misconduct” (the very circumstance to which Georgiana attributed her debility and her consequent inability to finish her task) “the Protector ordered her to be deprived of all her finery, and not allowed to wear any other than the estate's working dress until her behaviour is improved; to be confined solitarily from Saturday evening to Monday for one month;” (working of course in the field all the rest of the time) “and on the next Christmas holidays also to be in solitary confinement;—the four other women to be placed, for three hours, in the public stocks next Sunday.”—*Ibid.* p. 23.

Sir George Murray appears to have viewed this sentence in the same light that we do. “Under all the circumstances of the case,” he

observes, "I am disposed to think that this punishment was at once injudicious and unduly severe. The inefficacy of the treadmill to improve her conduct ought not to have been admitted as a reason for increasing the severity of the second punishment."—*Ibid.* p. 45.

3. On the 6th of October, 1828, JAN ZWART, belonging to Mr. Barnstedt, stated that he was sold at the Cruysburg sale, and was then separated from his wife and two children, the youngest then only four months old; that Mr. Culley purchased his wife and children; that he was bought by Mr. Barnstedt and sent to work with a task gang on a sugar plantation, the estate he had been sold from being a coffee one; that he could not eat or rest for the grief this separation occasioned in his heart; that he had been born on Cruysburg, and that his eldest brother who had also been born there was now sold to a different owner; and that about forty more slaves were sold under similar circumstances.—*Ibid.* p. 23.

This complaint was referred by the Protector to the Fiscal.

On the 7th of November, 1828, Jan Zwart re-appeared before the Protector, complaining that the Fiscal to whom he had gone had given him no redress. The Protector wrote to the Fiscal on the subject, but received no answer. On the 12th of January, 1830, Jan Zwart again applied to the Protector, and was again sent by him to the Fiscal. The Fiscal committed him to gaol, and next day sent him with a letter to Mr. Barnstedt, his owner, residing at Plantation Augsburg, of which he was the manager. Mr. Barnstedt put him, (Jan Zwart,) into confinement in the hospital, where he was locked up for a week without any food, so that he would have been starved had not a woman whom he knew on the estate brought him some; and on the 20th of January, Mr. Barnstedt sent him as a prisoner in custody to a distant plantation. But on the way thither, and while his keeper slept, Jan Zwart effected his escape, and on the 23rd of January again presented himself at the office of the Protector, who summoned all the parties before him. On the 28th of January the Protector received a letter from the Fiscal stating, that he had taken the utmost pains to induce Mr. Barnstedt to sell Jan Zwart to Mr. Culley, the owner of his wife and children, but had failed, the parties not agreeing about price; and that as no positive law had been infringed by the sale in question (the sale not having been judicial) he could institute no criminal prosecution with any effect.

On the 2nd of February 1829, the parties met at the Protector's office, when Mr. Barnstedt substantially admitted the material parts of Jan Zwart's allegations, namely, as to his having been sold separately from his wife and children; as to his having been closely confined in the hospital of Augsburg plantation, but because he was sick, (though no medical man saw him); and as to his having been sent off thence to a place distant four days journey from the estate on which his wife and children resided; and again the Protector called upon the Fiscal to interfere. The Fiscal, however, maintained that in all this there was nothing contrary to law, and to justify himself in that view of the case, he referred it to certain commissaries of the Court of criminal justice, who, (as he tells Mr. Power in his letter of the 11th

of February,) having investigated the complaint of Jan Zwart, found it to be without foundation, the evidence, in their view, not affording grounds for prosecution, and the conduct of Jan Zwart in bringing this unjust accusation against his master, being also extremely reprehensible; notwithstanding which, he (the Fiscal) did not mean to visit his conduct with any further punishment, than that of giving him a severe admonition, and then returning him to his master.—The Protector, with becoming spirit, protested against this decision in the strongest terms, and especially against either any punishment of any kind being inflicted on the complainant, or his being removed to such a distance from his wife and children. He wrote, at the same time, to the Governor, requesting a copy of the examinations taken by the Commissaries, and urging the farther detention of Jan Zwart for a few days until he had perused them.

The Governor, though agreeing in opinion with the Commissaries and the Fiscal, and thinking that Mr. Barnstedt was entitled to have his slave forthwith restored to him, yet yielded to the Protector's request, so far as to direct the farther detention of the complainant.

On the 14th of February, 1829, Mr. Power addressed to the Governor a letter, from which we deem it right to give some copious extracts:—

“I complain not,” he says, “of the decision of the Commissaries; but I cannot disguise that the manner in which the Fiscal brought the complaint before them was not calculated to elucidate the justice of the case. Had I known of the Commissaries being appointed, I should have solicited to attend the examination, and to be examined on oath, with my clerk, Mr. Hart, as to the conduct of Mr. Barnstedt at my office, and the attempted prevarication of February, (his sole witness). Mr. Hart and myself had seen Jan Zwart on the very day that he went to Augsburg. He was not then sick, quite the contrary. But the Ordinance itself indicates the mode of proving, before a Court of Law, the sickness of a slave; for it requires that a book shall be kept in every hospital, in which the names and treatment of all slaves shall be entered by the medical attendant under a penalty for every omission. But in the proceedings before the Commissaries, neither the registry, nor the medical attendant, was produced. Now Jan Zwart is admitted by all to have been confined in the hospital for eight days. He was so, either as an invalid, or for punishment. That he was not an invalid is proved by his not having been visited by the doctor, or furnished by him with medicines. Am I not justified then in declaring that he was so confined because he had complained to me of a great wrong, and sought the redress of the law. Besides is it not most extraordinary, that this alleged sick man, without the aid of physician or medicine was quite well enough to be transported to Willem's Hoop, the moment the boat had arrived to remove him?”

In a former parallel case, that of Mr. Nixon, the Receiver General of the Colony, (see Vol. ii. No. 43, p. 364.) “Your Excellency,” proceeds the Protector, in calling to it the Fiscal's attention, described this separation of families to be “so much at variance with what I have always considered to be the usage of the Colony, and must be so

prejudicial to its interests, that I think it necessary to call your attention to it, if it have not, (as I hope) already attracted your notice." And the Fiscal admitted in his reply that, "though not prohibited by any specific ordinance, it was nevertheless contrary to the usage and custom of the Colony."

"Here then is the case of Jan Zwart, returned, by the manager of Cruysburg, as living at that period in reputed marriage with his wife Beata, and one child proceeding from that marriage. The Fiscal indeed states, it was proved to him, (but of this I know nothing) that Jan Zwart himself, at the sale, requested to be sold with his mother, since dead. But Jan Zwart could not exercise any such option. No man can at his pleasure orphanise his child, or disengage himself from his paternal obligations; the child at least could be no party to such a disposition, and as his Protector, I protest solemnly against the principle and the precedent."

"I feel that in the dreadful alternative of separating either from mother or from wife, a negro may suffer under a great conflict of feelings; but the law which wishes to hallow and encourage the fidelity and permanence of conjugal ties, sternly deprecates the facility of divorce, a pregnant source of immorality wherever it has been tolerated. It was but the other day that a negro belonging to Mr. Gallez, before his honour the Fiscal, wished to be sold with his mother, rather than with his wife and children. Every gentleman present remonstrated with him on such an option, and told him that it could not be. What is the value of that reputed marriage record, which, as contradistinguished from the proceedings of other Colonial governments, has entitled your Excellency's government to the thanks of the people of England, if the first overt act, after its reception at the Protector's office, should prove to the world that, practically, it was a delusion in England, and a dead letter in Berbice.

"I also complain to your Excellency, that the poor negro, Jan Zwart, has not only been torn from his family, but that for having complained of his wrongs in the most clear and consistent manner, he is now to be banished to the remotest extremity of the Colony, with as much chance of an occasional interview with his family as if he were transplanted to the banks of the Oronoque." "And I must, in justice to him, say, that he bears a most excellent character, his name never appearing on the last four punishment records, saving once, and that for the offence of allowing a person to pass in a punt with him, from town, without a pass." "Willems Hoop too has no provision grounds; is never visited by any of the legally qualified medical practitioners of the Colony; and is so distant from plantains that the Negroes complain of insufficiency of food, though engaged in severe labour. It is considered as a punishment to send Negroes thither, being wholly out of the range of magisterial protection;—and yet this is the destination selected, by Mr. Barnstedt, for a valuable Negro, who, though injured himself, has been guilty of no offence. May I then hope that your Excellency will not permit the exercise of such a power to Mr. Barnstedt, which was refused by the Fiscal to Colonel Nixon and Dr. Monro, though the distance to which, in that case,

the slave was to be removed, was not more than twenty-one miles: I cannot account why a distinction should be made by his honour in this case—"but there are some records in the criminal jurisdiction of this Colony, which require a public officer to look, with considerable vigilance, at any course of proceeding which affords to Mr. Barnstedt the opportunity of exercising his caprice or his vengeance."

In consequence of this able representation the Governor forthwith issued "instructions to the Fiscal, to take such immediate measures as the law might direct for the purpose of annulling the sale of Jan Zwart, separate from his family."—*Ibid.* p. 32—37.

The case of Jan Zwart being thus committed by the Governor to the Fiscal, Mr. Daly, the King's Advocate was employed to bring it before the Court of civil justice; and on the 10th of February, 1830, that Court decided it in favour of the defendant, Mr. Barnstedt, and against the complaining slave, whose claim to be reunited to his family the Court rejected, condemning him, at the same time, in the costs of suit.—(*Ibid.* p. 103.) These costs will probably fall either on the Protector or on the government, as the slave of course must be unable to pay them.—And is there indeed no remedy for this violation of every principle of right? Must the people and the parliament of England and the king himself submit to this outrage committed in his name?

We have given this case also at length, as an undeniable refutation of another of the falsehoods put forth by our forty-one West Indian representatives, under the head of the non-separation of families.

There are several other complaints of the same description, arising from the same sale of Cruysburg, namely, that of ALABASTER, (p. 24.) that of FLORA and her three children, (p. 40.) in which case the conduct of the unconscious purchaser is highly honourable to him; and that of JAN BROOK, the purchaser of whom (Mr. Ross) refused to sell him to Mr. Prass the purchaser of his relations, though offered the price he had paid for him, and he sold him to another man, Mr. Patterson, for a larger sum.—(p. 52.)

4. On the 27th of October, 1828, CHRISTINA, belonging to plantation Nieuw Vigilantie, stated her case as follows:—"My father was an European, a Dutchman, manager of this plantation on which I was born. My first husband (keeper, viz.) was Mr. J. V. Mittelholzer, the brother of my present manager, with whom I lived for a year and a half, when he went to Europe and got married. I had by him two children who are still slaves. I was brought up a domestic, and was never used to field labour. Last year I came down to complain to Mr. Manrenbrecker, one of the attorneys of Vigilantie, with whom I remained employed as a sempstress till the other day, when he sent me back to the plantation; and, on my return, Mr. H. C. Mittelholzer, the present manager, ordered me to work in the field, to which I have never been brought up or used.

The Protector communicated this case to the Fiscal, adding, "I cannot withhold from your honour my opinion, that it exhibits a system of manners that baffles all my past experience." The Fiscal, in his

reply, admits that slaves, with European blood on the paternal side, are not usually treated as predial slaves, but chiefly as domestics or mechanics; but adds, that there is no law to prohibit their being employed in the field. Of course, poor *Christina* had no redress, but is one of the many victims who even now realise what was supposed the imaginary tale of Inle and Yarico. *Ibid*, p. 24.

5. *RICHARD*, complained that his master, F. E. Overeem, had both flogged him most causelessly, and also flogged him without the legal intermission of time between the offence, and the punishment. This last fact could not be denied; but the Protector having admitted Mr. Overeem to swear that he was ignorant of the law requiring such an intermission, (a fact perfectly incredible) consented to forbear to prosecute for the penalty, both because he promised not to repeat the offence, and because he being poor, the penalty and costs of the suit would ruin him.

We should have deemed this a very strong inducement for enforcing the penalty, as it must have issued in the forfeiture of Richard to the crown, and his consequent liberation.

We well recollect another Mr. Overeem, who was once manager of Sandvoort, and who about fourteen or fifteen years ago inflicted upon a poor Christian negress called America, then pregnant, 150 lashes of the cart-whip, for saying something which he deemed insolence to a worthless woman who was his concubine. The account of this horrid transaction, for which he suffered the mild infliction of three months imprisonment and a fine of £20 sterling, is officially given in the Parliamentary Papers for 1818, No. 433.

6. On the 10th of February 1829, *JASON* belonging to Mr. Ter Rechorst, stated that his master does not allow him either Sunday or noontide, and that he does not provide him with the usual allowance of food; and that he is obliged to beg provisions for his subsistence. To avoid a prosecution, the master consented to hire him out.

7. On the 11th of February 1829, *GELUK* and *COENRAAD*, belonging to Mr. Lantz, and hired to Mr. Barnstedt, at Willems Hoop plantation, states that they are employed in cutting timber, and are not properly fed either with plantains or salt fish; and it was impossible they should perform such hard labour if not properly fed. The plantains too which were given them were so bad that they deranged the bowels; and when they got sick, they had no doctor to visit the estate. (This is the same estate to which Jan Zwart was sent.) The Protector referred the matter to the Fiscal, but his decision has not yet been given. *Ibid*. p. 38.

8. On the 12th of February 1829, *JANUARY*, a boy belonging to Barrack-master Sherburne, complained that his master almost starved him, and treated him in a most cruel manner, beating him for pilfering bread to satiate his hunger. The boy's emaciated state induced the Protector to send him to the gaol where he might be properly fed. The starving was denied by Mr. Sherburne, and no illegal punishment was *proved* to have been inflicted. The boy's appearance, however, bore such evident marks of harsh treatment, Mr. Sherburne too having been already before the Protector for similar conduct, that the Pro-

pector ordered him to remain in gaol till his master could dispose both of him and his mother. The sale was effected on the 20th February.—In short, such was the hardship of his lot, that slavery under any other master who might chance to bid for him at an auction, was deemed to afford a chance of relief. *Ibid*, p. 39.

9. On the 3rd of March 1829, *WILHELMINA*, belonging to James Blair, Esq., M. P., stated that her mother was an Indian, named Annatje, and her father a white man, a doctor, residing at Anna Clementina, named Prange. Annatje died when *Wilhelmina* was very young. *Wilhelmina* then became the slave of Mr. George, and was afterwards sold along with his estate, (Plantation, No. 17, West-Coast,) to Mr. Blair. After Mr. Blair bought her, he took her to Barbadoes, and had her taught needle-work that she might provide for herself; in the intention she thinks of giving her her freedom. But, Mr. Blair dying, she was sent back to the Colony. *Wilhelmina* having established these facts in evidence, the Protector took the necessary steps for her liberation, and in August 1829, she, her two daughters, and two grand children were made free. *Ibid*, p. 50.

10. On the 27th of April 1829, *QUACO*, belonging to J. P. Dehnert, complained that going up the river in a boat with a free man named Christian, Christian, being in liquor, quarrelled with him, and then complained to Mr. Dehnert that *Quaco* had been saucy. In consequence of this charge he received twenty-five lashes on Saturday, April 18th. After having been flogged, he said he would go to the Protector to complain of being wrongfully punished. The driver reported the threat to Mr. Dehnert, who, on the very same day, caused him to be laid hold of and flogged with twenty-six lashes more; after which he was placed in the stocks till the Tuesday following. These facts being proved, the matter was referred to the Fiscal for prosecution. Mr. Dehnert was convicted and sentenced to be imprisoned in the common gaol for a month, and to pay a fine of 500 guilders, (about £35 sterling,) with costs of suit, &c. *Ibid*, pp. 51 and 67.

11. On the 29th of June 1829, *PAUL, ANTHONY, and BONAPARTE*, belonging to plantation D'Edward, complained that on Saturday last, after finishing their tasks, the manager Mr. D'Hankar ordered them to plant coffee; but having already finished their tasks for the day, they did not obey this order, and were flogged in consequence. A similar complaint was made by *CHRISTON, JULIA and PHILLINA*, belonging to the same plantation that, for the same act of disobedience, under the same circumstances, they were punished with six hours in the stocks. The manager's excuse was, that though their task had been set, he had desired them to break off for other more urgent work, but they had refused. The result was, that the manager was simply admonished in future to fix the tasks the day before; and that the slaves were told they must not refuse to obey any orders issued to them by the manager. *Ibid*, p. 55.

12. *NANCY* stated that she was kept by Mr. Macdonald, manager of plantation Waterloo, and was with child by him. Going to Waterloo, she found Clarissa in Mr. Macdonald's bed, and going to strike her for this provoking infringement of her rights, was herself beaten

by *Clarissa*. Mr. Macdonald then interfered and drove *Nancy* out of the house with a horse-whip, *Clarissa's* mother also beating her with a shoe. The Protector reprobated in strong terms the disgraceful nature of this transaction, and referred the complaint to the Fiscal, who had not yet decided upon it. *Ibid*, p. 57.

13. *PEGGY* stated that her mother was made free by Mr. Katz, but that neither her mother's freedom nor her own, nor that of her three children, whose fate followed her's, had been properly secured. The Protector finding that the names neither of *Peggy*, nor her three children were inserted in the Slave Registry, summarily ordered their freedom to be declared and properly secured to them. *Ibid*.

14. On the 19th of August 1829, *ADAM* and four other slaves, belonging to plantation *Reliance*, complained that as they were *throwing grass* on the preceding night, some indecency was committed which raised a laugh among the slaves, and which the overseer considered as insolence to himself. Mr. Gray, the manager, not being able to discover the person who had thus offended, selected these five men and put them in the stocks, threatening to punish them if they did not discover the offender. They either could not or would not name him. They were therefore flogged. This case was referred to the Fiscal, that he might decide whether there was ground to prosecute Mr. Gray for punishing five men because they refused to disclose the author of an indecent act. The result of this reference has not yet been given. *Ibid*, p. 61.

15. On the 8th of March 1830, *CASTLEREAGH*, belonging to Mr. Bond, complained that yesterday he had been put in the stocks, and his mother *MARGARET* in the stocks in the dark hole, in which she was still confined, their common crime being that they had not Mr. Bond's breakfast ready for him in proper time. The Protector sent his clerk to Mr. Bond, who, on his return, reported that having obtained the key of the dark-hole, he had there found *Margaret* with both feet in the stocks, shut up in a dark room, eight feet by five, having no window, nor any opening for the circulation of air. The Protector went immediately to the Fiscal and obtained *Margaret's* release. Mr. Bond was prosecuted and condemned to pay a fine of 150 guilders, (£10 12s. 6d. sterling) and the costs of suit. *Ibid*, p. 111.

16. On the 24th of March 1830, *JOHANNA*, belonging to plantation *Reliance*, complained that last week she was placed in solitary confinement for not finishing her task. On Monday she again left her task undone, and was confined at night in the bed-stocks. Being threatened next day with further confinement if she did not finish her task, she had come to complain of its excess. It was indeed, she admitted, not half of what others performed, but then, she was pregnant, and as she advanced in pregnancy was less able to work. She thought she ought not in that state to be confined in the bed-stocks.—Mr. Gray the manager, was desired to consult the doctor, and to proceed in respect to *Johanna* by his directions. *Ibid*, p. 112.

17. On the 27th of April 1830, *MARGARET* and *PRESENT* complained that, though they were old and infirm, their master Andrew Ross, gave them the same tasks as the other slaves, and, if they did

not perform it, confined them in the *public stocks*. *Present* exhibited her feet affected with the Elephantiasis, and complained of the pain she endured from confinement in the *public stocks*. The doctor of the estate admitted the impropriety of confining her in the *public stocks* which require a standing position, and thought that she should be placed in bed-stocks in a reclining position! Truly, the tender mercies of this doctor are somewhat cruel. And this seems to have been all the redress these poor old invalid women received! *Ibid*, p. 113.

These are only specimens of the 129 cases of complaint brought before the Protector, and of which we have any returns. We need not repeat the observations they are calculated to excite, and which we have too frequently been called to make in reference to this colony. And if such be the state of things in Crown Colonies, what must it be in the others, where there are no responsible protectors; where the secrets of the prison-house are revealed, when they are revealed, only by accident; and where there is therefore none of that restraint, arising from a fear of publicity, which is now made more or less to attach to the administration of the slave-laws in the Crown Colonies.

A few observations arising out of this report, remain still to be made.

1. We have been charged with incorrectness in what we have at different times asserted, respecting the night-work exacted from the slaves in crop-time. It had been proved, to Sir G. Murray's satisfaction, that the planters were in the habit of employing their slaves, at the works on their plantations, during a great part of the night. But, "however culpable may have been this conduct," I fear, he says, "that there is no ground to expect that they could be prosecuted to conviction; as it appears, with sufficient clearness, that this offence is not punishable under the Berbice Ordinance of September 1826; nor can I find that any earlier law of the Colony has denounced any penalty for misconduct of this nature. This defect in the law cannot however be too speedily supplied. You will therefore avail yourself of the earliest opportunity for proposing a Supplementary Ordinance for defining the hours of repose to be enjoyed, by all plantation slaves, during each night in the week; and for punishing all persons, who, during those hours, may employ such slaves in any species of labour." (*Ibid*, p. 104.) This peremptory instruction was issued by Sir G. Murray, on the 24th of November 1828; but hitherto we have seen no copy of any such Ordinance, and we fear, therefore, that it has not been enacted. But, whatever be the fact in this particular instance, during the past year, as far as Berbice is concerned, the correspondence serves to illustrate what we have said as to the gross frauds practised by the Colonial Legislatures, and by the planters generally, respecting that most important point the exaction of slave-labour. The laws generally, on the subject, whether in the Chartered or in the Crown Colonies, limit only the hours of labour in the field, and that limit is regulated only by the possibilities of the case. In Jamaica, and in most other Colonies, it embraces the hours from five in the morning till seven at night, with intervals of two hours or two hours and a half; (every hour in short, in which a glimmering of light

can be had to direct the slave's labour in the field.) But his labour does not therefore cease with those hours. There is no limit to exactions out of the field, except the will of the master, or the physical capacity of the slave. Half the night, or even the whole of the night, (the ten hours in short left free from the field) may be exacted in crop-time, at the pleasure of the master, not only on sugar, but also on coffee and cotton plantations. Here, as we have said, there is no limit except the will, or rather the cupidity, of the master, and the power of endurance of the slave. And yet, in all the pleadings of the West Indians in favour of the ease and happiness and comfort of the slave's lot, this monstrous aggravation of his toils and his sufferings is wholly lost from the view.—The same tortuous policy is pursued out of crop, and means are found, without violating any law, to encroach on the hours of the slave's repose, by unnoticed but cruel exactions; such, for instance, as collecting and carrying grass for the cattle, and other operations not requiring day-light; as bringing home on their heads plantains, wood for fuel, materials for building, &c. The reader may remark above at p. 359, the incidental mention of "*throwing grass*," and in the record of punishments now before us, we find forty-two instances of punishment for the specific offence of "neglecting to throw grass" after the labours of the field have closed; and this, without a single comment, or one note of reprehension, either from the Protector, or from those to whom he is amenable. The unlimited power of the master, in the exaction of labour, is thus further illustrated in the following passage of the Report before us. "The increase of punishments" (in 1828, says the Protector,) "is most probably to be attributed to a very large coffee crop in comparison with former years, and where" "every effort was made by the planter to obtain *his fullest share of labour* according to" (that is compatible with) law." *ibid*, p. 9. "How ineffectually the law restrains the master, we have already seen.

But this remark further illustrates one of the positions which we have always maintained, and which we have been abused for maintaining, as if it were paradoxical and untrue; namely, that such is the innate viciousness of this system as to render the fertility of soil, the productiveness of crops, and the various elements of the prosperity of the planter, a bitter curse, instead of a blessing to the wretched slave. (See Reporters, Vol. i. No. 17, 19, 22, 26, 35, Supplement to No. 61, &c.)

And here, be it remembered, that the *forty-one* distinguished West India proprietors, in their recent Manifesto, have had the boldness to proclaim, in defiance of the known facts of the case, that the exaction of the labour of the slave is effectually limited by law, no less than by the humanity of the planters, and by regard to their own interests.

2. Another point on which we have often dwelt, but hitherto with little effect, has been the regular and systematic violation of the Sabbath, and the determination of the planters not only to appropriate to themselves all the hours of the six days of the week which they can extort from the nerves and sinews of their bondmen and bondwomen, but to forego no means of evasion which may give them

the power of encroaching upon the Sabbath of the slaves. Not content with withdrawing from them, on the groundless plea of necessity, the ready plea of all tyrants, the three best hours of that sacred day, for the purpose of distributing to them their miserable weekly allowances; and with compelling them also to labour on the Sunday, whenever the state of the crops may seem to them to require it; they have further discovered, that, by employing Sunday as the special season of punishment, they shall be able to preserve, unbroken, the continuity of week-day labour, and thus swell their guilty gains. And they would have succeeded, by artful misrepresentations, in obtaining the concurrence of the Protectors in all the Crown Colonies to this most unholy appropriation, but for the resistance of the Secretary of State. Of the opprobrious tendency to this new desecration of the Sabbath, some remarkable proofs will be found in the Reporter, No. 83; and the Berbice Report, which we are now considering, adds to their number.—“It is evident,” says Sir George Murray, “from this Report, that Sunday is frequently made a day of domestic punishment. This is a practice open to so many abuses that the owner should never be permitted to resort to it without the previous sanction of a magistrate;” (*Ibid.* p. 44)—and never, we submit with all due deference, even then. The Sunday must of necessity be included in any term of imprisonment which exceeds six days; but surely the magistrate, if he be also a planter, should be absolutely prohibited, in all cases where the imprisonment is for a shorter period than a week, to include the Sunday; a provision of the utility of which our estimate will not be lessened, when we come to consider, which we shall now proceed to do, the facts these papers disclose respecting the state of religion and religious instruction among the slaves of Berbice; facts which, with slight variations, are equally applicable to every slave Colony belonging to this *Christian* land.

3. On the 25th of September, 1829, Mr. Beard, the Governor of Berbice, thus writes to Sir G. Murray:—“It certainly is deeply to be lamented that *no measures* should yet” (at the close of 1829) “have been adopted to afford religious instruction to the generality of the slave population, more particularly to ~~the~~ junior part of it. There are but two clergymen, one of the Established Church, the other from the London Missionary Society, in the Colony; and as it is impossible for them to extend their labours beyond the town, *the great mass of the slave population is unavoidably left in its original state of profound ignorance.* The improvements adverted to by the Protector, with the exception of granting an extra day in the week to the slaves to cultivate their provision grounds”—(without which, let it not be forgotten, all talk of improvement is mere hypocrisy, and all attempt at improvement, utterly futile and worthless, an evasion and a mockery)—“have long since been generally *agreed to* by the Council.”—(A council of planters will of course *agree* to any proposal which, in existing circumstances, can have no practical effect, and will not deprive them of one hour’s labour of any one of their slaves. Thus is the Government, and the Parliament, and the British public, gulled and cheated by a profession of zeal for religion.)—The Gover-

nor adds, that "at their next Session, I will not fail earnestly to bring the subject again before the Council." Did not the Governor know, at the time he wrote them, that these were vain and delusive words? (*Ibid.* p. 45.)

About the same period, (*viz.*: in Sep. 1829,) the Deputy Protector, Mr. Bird, thus addressed the Governor:—

"I beg leave to bring under your consideration the uninstructed state of the slaves in Berbice; a state of little perceptible difference from that of their African forefathers. I had hoped, on inquiry, to learn from the ministers of religion, that some plan was in agitation, if not already actually on foot, for conveying to them a knowledge of the principles of Christianity, and for affording, to the young at least, an opportunity of acquiring the first elements of education." He thus gives the result of his inquiries. "From the Lutherans," he says, "I have received no answer, nor do I believe they are able to afford one by any means satisfactory. Mr. Wray, the missionary, is the only person who has set himself zealously to work in disseminating knowledge among the slaves. He has proved plainly the necessity which exists for improving their minds, and that means of instruction and opportunities," (*time, viz.*) "alone require to be provided, for there is every desire on the part of the slaves, under much disadvantage, to seek tuition. To his letter on this and other subjects, connected with the improvement of the slaves, I beg to solicit your attention, and particularly to the very general violation of the Sabbath, by its being made, especially, a day for secular pursuits in the cultivation of provision grounds, the sale of stock, attending markets, &c." (doubtless including, in this &c. the three hours of Sunday morning given regularly and systematically to the distribution of the allowances of the slaves.) "This perversion of what ought to be kept sacred is now, (*viz.* in September 1829) at its height, and the practice is not likely to decrease, unless the legislature should interfere, and grant to the slave some other portion of the week, to make those additions to his comforts, which he does not expect to receive from any other source than the efforts of his own industry." *Ibid.* p. 46.

The inclosure in this letter from the Rev. T. Rowland, the one Clergyman of the Church of England, is to the following effect:—

"The short period I have been resident in this Colony, makes it impossible to answer your inquiry as satisfactorily as I could wish. With respect to the slave population of this Colony, I believe that, since the passing of the New Code in September 1826, their improvement is very limited, and the number converted to Christianity very few." "The Predial negroes are entirely without instruction. The Winkel negroes, in this respect, are better off. Indeed, they are the only ones within reach of instruction." "Many of them attend Mr. Wray at his missionary chapel; and the children, to the number of forty, go to a daily school, and their progress is very satisfactory. The children in the first class read very well, and are very perfect in the *Church Catechism*." (And yet Mr. Wray is a Dissenter.) "There are also some domestic slaves taught to read and write by some one in the family where they reside; but the number is not great. There is no

means of instruction provided by the established Church, for the slaves. There is no accommodation in my church but for very few. Shortly after I came here, I gave public notice, that if any proprietor should wish, or allow, their slaves to be instructed in the principles of Christianity, I should be happy to devote one afternoon each week for that purpose. *I attended a few times, but none came."*

This is very instructive. Not a proprietor was found in Berbice, who either wished or would permit, one of his slaves to attend on Mr. Rowland. On Sunday afternoon, he might possibly have collected a few; but the afternoon of a week-day, a day of labour, was too valuable to be thrown away in hearing of God, and Christ; of heaven and hell; of souls perishing, or of souls to be saved!

Next comes Mr. Wray's communication to the Protector. We mean to give some large extracts from it. He says,

"I am happy to observe that the change in the moral and religious conduct of many slaves, during the last three years, has been very considerable. A very great desire of improvement, and particularly to read and to say the catechism, has been manifested by a great number on various plantations. I have distributed 1,000 spelling-books, and a far greater number of catechisms, since February 1827, chiefly to slaves, and upwards of 50 copies of the Scriptures, since June 1828. The country slaves labour under great disadvantages: they can have no regular teacher to instruct them in reading; yet some make considerable progress, as they possess great perseverance, and get any one that can to give them a lesson. One negro told me last Sunday, that when any of the sailors went on the estate he asked them to give him a lesson."

"I beg to state that you might be of great service to the cause of Christianity, if you could use your influence with government that those heathenish dances and music, which are always accompanied with drunkenness, should be removed from the Sabbath to some other day of the week. They entirely unfit even those who wish to worship God, to do it with peace and devotion. It is a disgrace to the Christian community that *two* Sabbaths in the year should be legally set apart for dissipation and African dances and songs: and it is generally intimated in the *Royal Gazette*, that this dissipation is to begin at eight o'clock on Saturday night, and till Monday night at Easter; and till Sunday night at Whitsuntide. I know of nothing that has a greater tendency to demoralise the slaves, and keep up their African customs, than this. Surely some other day of the week could be given them in lieu of Sunday to practise their African songs and dances, and to get drunk. Nothing has a greater tendency to perpetuate heathenish superstitions than thus legalizing for them these two, and sometimes three, Sabbaths in the year. The abolition of Sunday markets is also an object worthy of your exertions, as they are a great obstacle to the moral and religious improvement of the slaves. How can these poor heathens believe the fourth commandment to be a part of the word of God, when they see our laws and customs in direct opposition to it?

"One proof of the good effects of the ameliorating influence of

Christian instruction, is the abolition of the superstitious practices of Obeah, which were once so prevalent, and which, according to the planters themselves, as well as of the negroes, had the most unhappy effects on the minds of many," and of their rites "in honour of the dead," which are attended with "great expense and superstitious ceremonies. I could give many instances of slaves converted from the belief and practice of these superstitions." "Formerly these things were very prevalent even among the Winkels," (his own peculiar charge,) "but they are now abandoned; at least they never come under my notice." "Except within a few miles of town, instruction has made but little progress: the negroes are yet in heathen darkness, and without the knowledge of the gospel. The estates high up the river, and all along the west bank of it, as well as on the east and west coasts have no means of instruction, and of course remain as ignorant as ever. And if I may judge of the state of the other slaves up the river, from the gross darkness in which we found the Crown negroes, on plantations Dankbaarheid, Dageraad, and Sandvoort, they are sad indeed. From the free access I had to these negroes, for the short time they were in possession of His Majesty's commissioners, I had an opportunity to become acquainted with their ignorance and moral darkness."

* This commission was appointed in 1811. The commissioners were Mr. Wilberforce, Mr. Stephen, Mr. Long now Lord Farnborough, Mr. Vansittart now Lord Bexley, Mr. W. Smith, and Mr. Gordon, deceased; and under their control and sanction, the conduct of the commission was placed in the hands of Mr. Z. Macaulay. It was but for a short space that the commissioners were permitted to retain their power; but short as that space was, their efforts were thwarted, not only by the local government, but by the government of the day at home, to a degree which almost wholly marred their purposes of benefit to the 1,200 slaves committed to their care. And they had the mortification not only of witnessing the frustration of the hopes with which they entered upon their office, but of having to endure a load of unmerited reproach for failures which were brought about by the very persons who calumniated them, but were attributed to their misconduct. In 1814 or 1815 the three estates were taken out of the hands of the commissioners and transferred to the Dutch government, and by it sold to English speculators. All Christian instruction, and all religious education were instantly banished from among the slaves, and the whole management reverted to the ancient system, from which it had been the effort of the commissioners to redeem them. The records of the Berbice Fiscal will shew some of the sad consequences which have resulted from the change.—But though the three estates were restored to the Dutch, there remained, in the chief town of the colony, a body of slaves belonging to the Crown, called the Winkels, consisting chiefly of mechanics of different kinds. To these, when they were replaced, by the commissioners, in the hands of the government, the Rev. Mr. Wray was continued as the religious instructor. He had been engaged by the commissioners, at the commencement of their undertaking, to superintend the religious interests of all the poor people entrusted to their care. When the estates were shut against his benevolent exertions, Mr. Wray still continued to instruct the Winkels, and his efforts among them have been marked by extraordinary zeal and diligence, and have been attended with gratifying success. But for the appointment of Mr. Wray to this station, not one spark of Christian light would have found its way into Berbice. The only germ of Christianity which exists there may be traced to Mr. Wray, and to the commissioners who nominated and

"Some time back a slave was sent to me to examine whether he might furnish the requisite certificate of his being qualified for the oath; but I found he knew no more about God, or the Christian religion, than one of the untaught Indians: he had never been in a place of worship; and indeed how there was no place within his reach." "I had hoped that the antislavery establishment would have prepared the way for the extensive usefulness of Christian missionaries, by the abolition of slave markets, and the establishment of schools for the slaves, so that they would have been prepared to receive and read the Bible. But, in this colony, I have to lament that not a single slave has been taught to read. A single school, has arisen from that appointment."

"With respect to the instruction afforded by this establishment to the slaves of the colony, you will form an idea from the following statement. In the three years since Sept. 1826, 91 adults, and 31 children, have been baptized. In the three preceding years, 31 adults, and 31 children. Those denominated children, are boys and girls, who have learned the catechism, and received instruction. As soon as they are baptized by me, till instructed in the doctrines and duties of Christianity, and till they give some evidence of a change of heart, I trust some have become converts, and any who act otherwise, the rules of the Gospel are censured, reprov'd, or excluded from communion.) The number admitted to the Lord's Supper in the three years is 39; one has been excommunicated for immorality. In the three previous years only seven slaves had been admitted to the Lord's Supper. In the Sunday School there are at present 100 scholars all learning to read. A number of these belong to the Wesleyan Society, of whom read well in the Bible, and also religious tracts. The time of them being taught in a *day* school, the time in the Sunday School is chiefly occupied in religious instruction, the scholars learn by memory considerable portions of catechisms, the Lord's Prayer, and hymns. They attend for the same purpose every Wednesday evening. A class of adult slaves also read the Bible in the Sunday School, also on Tuesday evening. Many of Mr. Blair's slaves, who live on the coast, are learning to read, and a few can read easy portions of the Bible and Testament. They attend chapel when they can get across the river; and, during the Christmas and Easter holidays, many of them spent all their time in the school-room or church, instead of attending to heathenish customs."

Now is it not marvellous that, after the attention of the public has been drawn, for years, to the state of our colony—after the repeated pledges of reform which have been given by the government, and the volumes of admonition

supported him; and if their maligned commission had produced the results they would feel abundantly repaid for every sacrifice of time and money, and all the obloquy it drew upon them, by the present aspect of the colony, and the success of the mission established by Mr. Wray, and so successfully conducted, in the face of all trial and difficulty, to its present hour of advancing prosperity.

written by our Secretaries of State;—and after all the assurances conveyed from year to year, to parliament and the public, of progressive improvement;—is it not, we repeat, most marvellous that, in the year 1831, we should be doomed to witness, in a British Colony, not forty days sail from the British shores, scenes such as those which the preceding pages exhibit to our view? But such is slavery; and slavery too, not such as West Indian enactments alone have made it. Let us here do the West Indians justice. The laws of Berbice are the laws, not of Colonists, but of the British crown. The laws which sanction most of the outrages we have had the pain of disclosing, and recording, are laws emanating from the King in Council, passed, we fear, under the influence of Colonial delusion, while wiser and safer counsels, which would at least have saved the nation from some of the opprobrium which now attaches to it, and spared some of the blood which now stains our hands, and makes its appeal to heaven against this guilty land, have been contemned and rejected.* In the chartered colonies, there may be some semblance of excuse for the toleration of the crimes which have there been perpetrated, though it be only the semblance. But, in Berbice and the other Crown Colonies, the government have themselves been the lawgivers. The law, for example, which has permitted a few owners or managers of estates, without judge or jury or form of trial, to inflict 13,000 floggings, in two years, on the adult males of Berbice, and to imprison in stocks, and to immure, in dark and solitary dungeons, equal to its whole adult female population;—the law which has enabled the master to grind down the slave with exactions by day and by night;—the law which puts it in the power of the master to deprive his slave of the blessed rest of the Sabbath, and to shut him out from the light of heaven itself;—the law also which leaves the master free almost to starve his slave, and even to kill him by inches;—this law is the work, not of the planters of Berbice or of the other Crown Colonies, but of the government of Great Britain; of the King in his supreme council; of the ministers of the British throne.—And shall such laws, we ask again, be continued even for another year? If so, the time is surely come for the people of this Christian land, to protest still more loudly than they have yet done, against these abominations;—to wipe their own hands at least of this foul stain;—and perseveringly to employ their utmost exertions, and their unceasing prayers in labouring to break every yoke, and to deliver every British slave from his bitter bondage. From our present rulers, indeed, we look for better things. They seemed to have been raised to power, on a former occasion, in order to abolish the British Slave Trade. We trust, that, under the Divine blessing, they will now be made the honoured instruments of extinguishing British slavery also.

* Mr. Wilmot Horton, than whom there can be no more competent witness, told us, in his letters to the freeholders of Yorkshire, that it was the deliberate and systematic plan of the administration under which he acted, to seek the advice and concurrence of the planters, with respect to their measures of reform, but to exclude from all communication of their purposes, the advocates of the wretched slave.

II.—DONATIONS AND REMITTANCES IN AID OF THE FUNDS OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, FROM JANUARY 1, TO MAY 14, 1831.

	£.	s.	d.		£.
The Rev. T. Gisborne . . . (Donation)	5	0	0	T. R. Guest, Esq. per Mr. Vatchell, Cardiff . . . (Donation)	1 1
Scarborough Association . . . (Payment)	10	0	0	Mr. Vatchell, Cardiff . . . (Payment)	1 10
Liverpool Association . . . (Ditto)	20	16	0	Aberdeen Association . . . (Payment)	7 17
Rev. M. M. Preston (Ann. Subscription)	5	0	0	Alton Ladies Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2 3
Whitby Association . . . (Payment)	5	8	6	Joshua Strangman, Esq. 17, Cheapside . . . (Annual)	2 2
Reading Ladies' Association . . . (Ditto)	5	0	0	Kingston Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	1 14
Surrey Association . . . (Ditto)	5	7	0	A. B. . . . (Donation)	0 5
W. Everest, Esq. (Annual Subscription)	1	1	0	Peckham Association . . . (Payment)	6 16
Camberwell Association . . . (Payment)	2	7	0	Worcester Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	6 0
Manchester Ladies' Association . . . (Donat.)	30	0	0	Colchester Association . . . (Payment)	14 16
Ditto . . . (Payment)	5	12	0	Leicester . . . (Ditto)	5 8
Sunderland Association . . . (Ditto)	5	8	0	Halifax Ditto . . . (Ditto)	10 6
Berkhamstead Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2	2	0	Hertford Ditto . . . (Ditto)	7 0
Hanley and Shelton Association . . . (Ditto)	6	16	6	Gainsboro' Ditto . . . (Ditto)	15 0
Mr. Joseph Davis, Taunton . . . (Donation)	1	0	0	Legacy of Mrs. Macdonald, of Lymington, by the Rev. J. Millard . . . (Payment)	22 10
Newcastle-upon-Tyne Ladies' Association . . . (Ditto)	8	17	5	Lymington Association . . . (Ditto)	1 1
Chipping Norton Association . . . (Payment)	2	7	0	Mr. J. Marriage, Maldon . . . (Ditto)	0 12
Devizes Association . . . (Ditto)	3	12	0	Bridport Association . . . (Ditto)	3 13
Mrs. Kennaway, Charnmouth . . . (Donation)	1	0	0	Miss Crouch, St. Ives . . . (Ditto)	0 10
Mr. Jonathan Barrett . . . (Annual)	1	0	0	Margate Association . . . (Ditto)	1 14
William Hall, Esq. Cheltenham . . . (Ditto)	2	2	0	Westminster Ladies' Association . . . (Ditto)	5 10
Miss Yerbury, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2	2	0	London Ladies' Depository, Gracechurch Street . . . (Ditto)	9 5
Miss Finch, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	1	1	0	Chelmsford Ladies' Association . . . (Ditto)	16 4
A Friend, per the Record Newspaper . . . (Donation)	1	0	0	Ditto . . . (Donation)	10 0
Worcester Association . . . (Payment)	20	2	6	Birmingham, Woodgreen, &c. Ladies' Negro Friend Society . . . (Payment)	7 7
Penzance Ditto . . . (Ditto)	4	1	7	Miss Prideaux . . . (Ditto)	1 0
Ditto Ditto . . . (Donation)	0	18	5	Hull Association . . . (Ditto)	11 16
Poston Association . . . (Payment)	7	18	0	Mrs. Archdale Palmer, Cheam . . . (Annual)	1 1
Doncaster Ditto . . . (Ditto)	7	5	6	Rastrick Association . . . (Payment)	0 14
Ditto . . . (Donation)	1	14	6	North East London Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	3 2
Mr. Sargeant, March, Isle of Ely . . . (Paym.)	2	0	0	R. Purvis, Esq. Sunbury . . . (Annual)	5 7
Rt. Hon. Lord Calthorpe . . . (Donation)	30	0	0	Mrs. Purvis, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	3 3
Leeds Association . . . (Payment)	21	15	5	Miss Jane Purvis, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2 2
Taunton Association . . . (Ditto)	20	10	0	Miss Elizabeth Purvis, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2 2
Miss Allen, Stepney Causeway . . . (Ditto)	2	9	0	Miss Frances Purvis, Ditto . . . (Ditto)	2 2
T. E. Dacey, Esq. Claybrook Hall . . . (Ann.)	5	5	0	Chesterfield Association . . . (Payment)	0 18
Rev. T. Galland . . . (Ditto)	1	1	0	H. Upher, Esq. . . . (Donation)	10 10
Cirencester Association . . . (Payment)	10	17	4	York Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	2 16
Salisbury, Calne, Melksham, Devizes, &c. Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	25	0	0	Ditto Gentlemen's Ditto . . . (Ditto)	5 12
A Friend . . . (Ditto)	2	0	0	William Evans, Esq. M.P. 2 yrs. Annually . . . (Don.)	4 4
Stoke Newington Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	1	12	8	Mrs. Roberts, Charnmouth, Dorset . . . (Ditto)	20 0
F. Munro, Esq. Lower Bedford Place . . . (Annual)	1	1	0	Peckham Association . . . (Ditto)	20 0
John Dickenson, Esq. . . . (Ditto)	1	1	0	Birmingham, &c. Ladies' Negro Friend Society . . . (Ditto)	60 0
Archdeacon Corbett . . . (5th Donation)	2	0	0	Committee of the Society of Friends, for the entire Abolition of the Slave-Trade and Slavery . . . (Ditto)	1000 0 0
Edward Dutton, Esq. . . . (3rd Donation)	1	0	0	Hanley and Shelton Association . . . (Ditto)	10 10
Nicholas Hingouton, Esq. . . . (Donation)	5	0	0	Miss Yerbury, Cheltenham . . . (Payment)	3 3
A Friend, by I. P. . . . (Ditto)	1	0	0	Birmingham Association . . . (Ditto)	19 16
Gracechurch Street Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	1	1	0	Kendal . . . (Donation)	12 0
Contributions from Litchfield, per W. G. Bird, Esq. . . .	3	13	6	Ditto Ladies' Ditto . . . (Ditto)	8 0
Woodbridge Ladies' Association . . . (Donat.)	5	0	0	Carlisle Association . . . (Ditto)	10 10
Ditto . . . (Payment)	3	15	0	Joseph Sturge, Esq. Birmingham . . . (Ditto)	20 0
Neath and Swansea Association . . . (Ditto)	8	17	6	Collection at Public Meeting . . .	78 12 11
Rev. J. Fisher, Clifton Campville, Staffordshire . . . (Donation)	0	10	0	Dorking Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	0 0
Tottenham Ladies' Association . . . (Payment)	3	13	6	North London and Islington Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	20 0
Plaistow and West Ham Ladies' Association . . . (Ditto)	0	17	9	George Long, Esq. . . . (Ditto)	1 1
Hitchin Association . . . (Ditto)	8	7	0	Mr. Bousheld, Manor Place, Waltham . . . (Annual)	1 0
Mr. Franks, Clapham . . . (Donation)	0	10	6	North Staffordshire Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	15 0
Mrs. Hoare . . . (Payment)	0	4	4	Bridlington Association . . . (Ditto)	7 8
Mr. Thomas Whitwell, Peterborough . . . (Donation)	1	0	0	A Friend . . . (Ditto)	20 5
Huddersfield Ladies' Assoc. . . . (Payment)	7	5	9	Southampton Association . . . (Payment)	7 16
Rev. W. M. Bunting, Huddersfield . . . (Annual)	1	1	0	Tottenham Ladies' Ditto . . . (Ditto)	1 1
Mr. J. Burnley, Gomersal . . . (Ditto)	0	10	0	Maidstone Association . . . (Ditto)	1 0
Ross Association . . . (Payment)	6	15	0	Mr. Gibson, Saffron Walden . . . (Donation)	5 0
Ditto . . . (Donation)	3	0	0	John Hinton, Esq. of Stoughton . . . (Ditto)	5 0
Mrs. Pearson, Salisbury . . . (Ditto)	10	0	0	Rev. A. Brandram . . . (Annual)	1 4
Nottingham Ladies' Association . . . (Paym.)	0	11	0	Rev. J. Riland, Yoxall . . . (Donation)	1 0
Colebrookdale Association . . . (Ditto)	5	15	6	A. B. G. Wood, Esq. . . . (Donation)	0 5
London Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	50	0	0	Mrs. Taylor, Hackney . . . (Subscription)	0 5
Kendal Association . . . (Payment)	7	13	8	Mrs. Clack, Hackney . . . (Subscription)	0 4
Rochester Ditto . . . (Ditto)	4	6	0	Anonymous . . . (Payment)	1 16
Taunton Ladies' Association . . . (Donation)	5	0	0	Gosport Association . . . (Payment)	1 16
Sherfield Ladies' Ditto . . . (Payment)	10	6	6		

*. The list of Donations and Remittances will be completed in our next Number, and the Donations of June.

